

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/863,666	Applicant(s) ADAMS, RONALD
	Examiner Kathryn Odland	Art Unit 3743

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kathryn Odland.

(3) _____.

(2) Kevin Mun

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11/4/04

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6,086,600 US 5,554,169

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

- We discussed possible claim amendments to claim 1, such as "a closing mechanism ~~contacting~~ an outer surface of at least one of the arms away from the other arm." It was agreed this was ~~not~~ not demonstrated in Kortenbach regarding a 35 USC 102 (a/e) rejection. No formal agreement was made to amend the claim to include such language
- Applicant discussed the 35 USC 103 (a) rejection over Kortenbach in view of Green et al. See continuation sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Kathryn Odland
Examiner's signature, if required

Applicant argues the reason to combine. The examiner will review the rejection and position.

The double patenting rejection was discussed. Applicant will put remarks on the record and the examiner will review. Perhaps the serial number was incorrect in the previous office action.